
RTC Report Framework

Draft for Discussion

Introducing the RTC

- Background
 - Statutory Mandate & Goals
 - Composition
 - Methods
 - Research
 - Examples of other regions
 - Outreach
 - Public Deliberations
 - Product

Importance & History of Transportation

■ Importance

- ❑ Economic Growth
- ❑ Individual Mobility

■ Demographic Changes in Region

■ Financing History

■ Growth of Transit and Roads

■ Growth of Planning

- ❑ PSRC as MPO
- ❑ WSDOT
- ❑ RTID
- ❑ Regional “partnerships” (inter-local & state/local)

Challenges

- System not meeting needs
 - ❑ Increased congestion
 - ❑ Delays in freight/port traffic
 - ❑ Deterioration of infrastructure
- Underlying Causes
 - ❑ Historic under-building
 - ❑ Public perceptions
 - ❑ Unclear system of prioritization
 - Competition between jurisdictions
- Financing Challenges: Is there enough money?
 - ❑ How much is required?
 - ❑ New sources?

Governance Goals

- Create and support regional vision?
- Integrate land use and economic development with transportation planning?
- Encourage multi-modal solutions?
- Fair prioritization of projects
- Use existing partnerships when possible?

Alternative Models & Choices

- Status quo
- Voluntary association or mandatory cooperation?
- Boards elected, appointed or federated? Voting?
- Relationship to existing planning bodies? Transportation bodies?
- Transportation functions? Plan, Construct, Operate?
- Modal scope? Which roads? Which transit?
- Relationship to local government authorities? to WSDOT?
- Planning integration with land use, economic development?
- Financing strategies

RTC Conclusions

- Stage one: possible choices
- Stage two: recommendations
 - What feedback was from stage one
 - Why we chose the model we did
 - Implementation
 - What timetable for implementation
 - How to integrate with existing structure and funding

Draft Framework RTC Report

- 1) Executive Summary
- 2) Regional Transportation Commission – its work
 - a) Mission – contained in authorizing statute
 - i) Governance model specifically for Puget Sound region
 - ii) Model includes composition, scope, functions, authority, fiscal/funding, relationships with other governments
 - b) Statutory goals
 - i) Promote congestion relief
 - ii) Governmental efficiency (elimination of redundant processes)
 - iii) Be open to public input, and foster public confidence in transportation reform
 - iv) Increase supply of transportation services, or reduce demand for transportation services
 - c) Composition of Commission
 - i) How chosen
 - ii) Members (bios in appendix 1)
 - d) Methods
 - i) Gathering analysis by national transportation experts
 - ii) Soliciting testimony through public hearings
 - iii) Examine other models of governance in similar cities
 - iv) Public deliberations
 - v) Presenting and weighing specific alternatives from among those offered
 - e) Product – Report to the Governor, Legislature containing specific proposal
- 3) Role and importance of transportation
 - a) Transportation is vital
 - i) Necessary for economic growth, both local and Puget Sound as a trade partner for Pacific Rim
 - ii) Necessary for individual mobility, both work and non-work related trips
 - iii) Lifestyle expectations
 - b) Structural changes in our region
 - i) Population growth and urbanization
 - ii) Density in major metropolitan areas
 - c) Suburbanization and decentralization of Puget Sound economy
 - d) History of transportation and transportation agencies
 - i) Roads history
 - ii) Changes in funding – from Federal to state, local sources.
 - (1) End of interstate highway support
 - (2) History of gas tax- revenue tapers off
 - (3) Changes in federal funding model
 - iii) Transit
 - (1) Metro, Community Transit, Kitsap Transit, Pierce Transit and Everett Transit

- (2) Sound transit
 - iv) RTID
 - v) Governance planning and funding
 - (1) PSRC, Destination 2030, and its role as MPO, mandated by ISTEA and TEA-21 (requires more local input)
 - (2) DOT and Transportation Commission
 - (3) 5¢ package
 - (4) 9½¢ package and I-912
 - vi) Public literature and study recommendations
 - (1) Blue Ribbon Commission
 - (2) PSRC and RTID planning documents
 - (3) Non-legislative studies
 - (a) *How Do We Get There From Here*: Bruce Agnew & Bruce Chapman, Cascadia Institute
 - (b) *The Institutional Conundrum*: Deb Eddy, Discovery Institute
 - (c) *Transportation Governance; A Civic Conversation*: Regional Governance Project
 - (d) *Governing Transportation*: The Washington Roundtable
- 4) Current planning and prioritization arrangements in Puget Sound
- a) Role of DOT and comments from outreach
 - b) Role of Sound Transit and RTID and comments from outreach
 - c) Role of PSRC and comments from outreach
 - d) Role of Counties and comments from outreach
 - e) Role of Cities and comments from outreach
 - f) Role of others including Ports, Tribes, etc and comments from outreach
 - g) Comments from outreach by other constituents
- 5) Transportation Challenge
- a) Transportation systems not meeting needs
 - i) Increasing commuter congestion
 - ii) Delays in Freight/Rail/Port traffic
 - iii) Deterioration of transportation infrastructure
 - iv) Difficulty and delays in constructing new transit or highway systems
 - b) Causes
 - i) Under building of major infrastructure for period in past 30 years.
 - ii) Public perception of combination of the inability of government to spend tax dollars wisely and lack of accountability to public
 - (1) Funding constraints by initiative challenges
 - (2) Defeat of transportation initiatives (R-51)
 - (3) Case Study: Defeat of Initiative 912
 - iii) Inconsistent and unclear system for prioritizing projects – governance issues
 - iv) Lack of cooperation and increased competition across local jurisdictions – planning/finance/governance issues
- 6) Financing Challenge: Is there enough money?
- a) How much is required

- i) Needs from Destination 2030, Blue Ribbon report, examples from recent testimony from hearings
 - ii) Do reports consider risk of reduced revenue from lower gas usage from conservation in higher priced oil environment.
 - b) What are present sources (Federal, State, Regional, Local)
 - c) Is there inefficiency in the present system that results in higher costs?
 - d) Resulting shortfall (if any)
 - i) What are alternative sources that might be available? (Gas tax, Sales tax, MVET, tolling, hot lanes, other)
 - ii) How can available resources best be prioritized?
- 7) What should be the goals and success criteria for transportation governance system in the Puget Sound region?
- a) Create and support “regional” vision?
 - b) Role of land use and economic development objectives in transportation planning?
 - c) Represent internal geographic interests fairly, without allowing balkanization?
 - d) Encourage multi-modal solutions for congestion and balance funding for roads and transit?
 - e) Encourage coordination of transportation and land use planning while working within guidelines of existing planning documents (Vision 2030, GMA, etc.)? Support and further partnerships between jurisdictions
 - f) Fairly prioritize most necessary regional projects in a timely manner
- 8) What is employed and works elsewhere?
- a) Regional governance (Portland, Vancouver, Toronto model)
 - b) Limited regional governance (San Diego, Denver)
 - c) Inter-local agreements (Phoenix)
 - d) State/regional mix (San Jose)
- 9) What are the alternative available models (choices)?
- a) Status Quo
 - b) Voluntary inter-local association(s)
 - c) State runs regional transportation for region
 - d) Regional authority runs
 - e) In each model, what is the:
 - i) Board composition
 - ii) Breadth and depth of authority
 - iii) How is leadership determined
 - (1) Elected
 - (2) appointed and if so by whom
 - (3) ex-officio model
 - (4) Combination of the two?
 - (5) How often should the leadership change?
 - f) Issues each model must address:
 - i) How to balance involvement in transit and roads.
 - ii) Which of the four “transportation functions,” planning, funding, capital/infrastructure building, operation should regional entity control or participate in?

- (1) Relationship to current planning agency (PSRC)
 - (2) Authority over land use functions?
 - iii) Should authority have enforcement authority? If so, what kind, and how is it exercised?
 - iv) Which governance functions are best addressed at the regional level and which more appropriate for local control?
 - v) How does prioritization of regional projects take place?
 - vi) Relationship to state DOT?
- 10) Financing strategies: Choices of financing capacity for regional authority
- a) Sources: Should it have taxing authority? If so, what kind? Bonding limits? Revenue through tolls and/or congestion-based pricing?
 - b) Structural issues
 - i) Status quo
 - c) Role of popular votes
 - d) To what extent should a regional authority provide resources equitably to sub-areas within the region, and how should equity or sub areas be defined?
- 11) Conclusions
- a) Suggested governance model
 - i) Composition
 - ii) Scope
 - iii) Function
 - iv) Relationships with existing transportation/planning entities
 - b) Financing strategies
- 12) Implementation:
- a) Timing
 - b) Goals of existing agencies and government entities
 - i) Don't disrupt funding, planning already in pipeline
 - ii) Stabilize and increase future funding

Appendices

- a) Member bios
- b) Encyclopedia
- c) Results from outreach 1
- d) Alternatives presented after outreach 1
- e) Comments on alternative proposals